



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,276	06/26/2003	Yukimitsu Iwata	123815	3369
25944	7590	08/30/2007	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			AHMED, SHEEBA	
P.O. BOX 19928			ART UNIT	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			PAPER NUMBER	
			1773	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			08/30/2007	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/606,276

Applicant(s)

IWATA ET AL.

Examiner

Sheeba Ahmed

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, and 4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1773

DETAILED ACTION

Request or Reconsideration

1. The Request for Reconsideration filed on August 23, 2007 has been entered in the above-identified application. Applicants arguments with regards to the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement have been fully considered and found persuasive.

Furthermore, the Examiner has reconsidered the finality of the previous rejection in the last Office action and the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Prosecution is hereby re-opened. **Claims 1, 2, and 4 are pending.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mackawa (US 6,217,176 B1).

Mackawa discloses an antiglare film for use on the surface of displays for high definition images such as CRT and liquid crystal panels (Column 1, lines 4-6). The antiglare film comprises a transparent substrate film and an antiglare layer stacked onto the transparent substrate film, the antiglare layer being formed of a light transparent resin containing two or more types of light transparent fine particles

Art Unit: 1773

(Column 2, lines 42-48). The light-transparent resin may be an ionizing radiation cured resin and the two or more types of transparent fine particles have a particle diameter of 1 to 5 microns (Column 2, lines 63-68). The particle diameter is not less than 1 micron and not more than 5 microns. When the particle diameter is less than 1.0 micron, the light diffusing effect cannot be attained without significantly increasing the amount of the light-transparent fine particles added to the light-transparent resin. On the other hand, when the particle diameter exceeds 5.0 microns, the surface of the antiglare layer 18 is rough, unfavorably resulting in increased haze. The diameter of the light-transparent fine particles is more preferably not less than 2 microns and not more than 4 microns (Column 4, lines 28-39). The film-forming component used in the ionizing radiation curable resin contains an acrylate functional group (Column 5, lines 14-16).

Mackawa et al. do not specifically state that the particle size distribution is as claimed in the instant invention. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to optimize the particle size distribution given that the light diffusing effect and the surface haze of the antiglare layer can be varied by varying the particle size distribution.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with regards to the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mackawa (US 6,217,176 B1) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants traverse the above rejection and

Art Unit: 1773

submit that in contrast to Maekawa, claims 1 and 2 each specifically recite a single type of transparent fine particles and thus require only one type of fine transparent fine particle, not two or more as required in Maekawa.

However, the Examiner disagrees with the Applicants interpretation of the claim language. Independent claims 1 and 2 each recite that "the anti-dazzling layer comprises an ionizing radiation-curable resin, a single type of transparent fine particles, and a leveling agent" however the anti-dazzling layer can contain other types of particles since open-ended claim language is used to recite the contents of the anti-dazzling layer.

Hence, the above rejection is reinstated.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheeba Ahmed whose telephone number is (571)272-1504. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 9:30am to 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on (571)272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1773

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sheeba Ahmed', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Sheeba Ahmed

Art Unit 1773

August 25, 2007